

THE  
NEVV HERESIE  
OF THE  
JESUITS:

Publickly maintain'd at *PARIS*  
in the Colledge of *CLERMONT*, 3938. ann. 61  
by *Conclusions*, Printed 12. Decemb. 1661.

Denounced to all the

BISHOPS  
OF  
FRANCE.

Translated out of the French Original.

Lucæ 5. 39.

*Nemo bibens vetus, Statim vult novum: dicit enim,  
vetus melius est.*

L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year of our Lord 1662.





THE  
NEW HERESIE  
OF THE  
JESUITS;

*Publike maintained at Paris in the Colledge of  
Clermont, by Conclusions, Printed the 12 of De-  
cember 1661. Denounced to all the Bishops of  
France.*



It is the duty of Bishops to cut off, whilst they are yet in the bud, the Errors that tend to the ruine of Faith; so is it no less the part of Divines, to make Discovery of them, and stir up their pastoral vigilance by giving them a timely advice thereof.

For which Reason, *My Lords*, you will not I am confident, disapprove the Information given you of a *New Heresie* publike-ly maintained by the *Jesuites* in their Colledge of *Paris*, by *Conclusions*, printed and defended the 12 of *December* past, which bear in Front this Title: *Affertiones Catholicae de Incarnatione contra seculorum omnium ab Incarnato verbo precipuas haereses. Catholike Assertiions of the Incarnation, against the principal Heresies of all Ages since Christ*: Whereby they sufficiently intimate, that excepting some subtilties of the Schools, they would have us take for Catholike truths, whatever else they advance in opposition to these Heresies.

They propose then for the Heresie of the 10<sup>th</sup> Age, the Schism of the *Grecians*, and pretend by the following words to pre-

(4)  
scribe us what we ought to beleieve, that we fall not into this  
Hereſie.

## X. SÆCULUM.

*Romane Eccleſia Caput, contra Græcos Schiſmaticos.*

**H**Oc tandem ſeculo Schiſma Photii invaleſcens, Græcos, ab Eccleſia capite diſ-junxit. Chriſtum nos; ita caput agnoſcimus, ut illius regimen dum in calos abiit, primum Petro tum deinde ſucceſſoribus commiſerit, & eandem quam habebat ipſe infallibilitatem conceſſerit, quoties ex Cathedrâ loquerentur.

Datur ergo in Eccleſia Romana Controverſiarum Fidei Jdex infallibilis, etiam extra Concilium generale tam in queſtionibus Juris, quam Facti. Unde poſt Innocentii X. & Alexandri VII. Conſtitutiones, fide divinâ credi poteſt, librum cui titulus eſt Auguſtinus Janſenii eſſe hæreticum, & quinque Propoſitiones ex eo excerptas, eſſe Janſenii, & in ſenſu Janſenii damnatas.

Propugnabuntur Deo duce, & auſpice Virgine in Aula Collegii Claramontani Societatis Jeſu, die 12 Decembris, Anno 1661.

## X. AGE.

*The Head of the Roman Church againſt the Schiſmatick Grecians.*

**I**T was in this Age that the Schiſm of Photius growing ſtrong; cut off the Grecians from the Head of the Church; for our parts we acknowledge Jeſus Chriſt to be in ſuch ſort the Head, that he hath left the government firſt to S. Peter, and afterwards to his Succeſſors, and that he hath bequeathed unto them, as often as they ſhall ſpeak out of their Chair; the ſame infallibility which he himſelf had.

Wherefore there is in the Church of Rome, an infallible Judge of Controverſies of Faith, even out of a General Council; as well in Queſtions of right, as matters of Fact, for which  
reaſon



reason, now after the Constitutions of Innocent X, and Alexander VII, one may believe with Divine Faith, that the Book of Jansenius, intituled *Augustinus*, is Heretical: and that the five Propositions extracted out of it, are of Jansenius, and condemned in his sense.

This Conclusion contains two parts; One, the Primacy of the Pope; in which all Catholics agree: The other the Infallibility which the Jesuits attribute to him.

Nor is the question, concerning that Infallibility, which some Divines maintain, and which regards only the judgments of Popes touching the truths revealed by God in the Holy Scripture and Tradition.

It is well known what the opinions of the Gallican Church, and School of Paris are upon this Subject: and what is to be understood by their words *Sententia Parisiensium*, when one meets with them in the Books, even of Jesuits, upon this matter.

It is also known, that those among some modern Doctors, who would be most favourable to Poper, as Dr. Du Val, were nevertheless of Opinion, that it is not a point of Faith, that the Pope is Infallible; *Non est de Fide summum Pontificem esse infallibilem*; and that the contrary opinion, is neither erroneous nor rash; *Non est erroneum neque temerarium temeritate opinionis dicere summum pontificem in decernendo errare posse*.

But these same Divines how passionate soever they were, to exalt the authority of the Sovereign Bishops, do acknowledge, as a thing certain, unquestionable, and agreed on by all Catholics, that in matters of fact, they are not infallible, but may be deceived, and so really have been in sundry occasions. All Catholics are of Agreement, says Cardinal Bellarmine, that the Pope, acting as Pope, with advice of his Council, nay even of a general Council, may be deceived in particular affairs, depending on the information and attestation of Men. And, applying this general Maxim to a particular fact, altogether conformable to that of Jansenius, to wit, whether the Heresie of the Monothelites were contain'd in the Letters of Honorius, as the VI general Council, confirmed by so many Popes, had determined: A General Council! says he, that is a lawful one, cannot erre in the definition of dogmatical points of Faith, wherein the VI Council likewise was  
free

free from error; but it may erre in questions of Fact. *Generale Concilium legitimum non potest errare, at neque erravit hoc sextum, in dogmatibus Fidei definiendis: tamen errare potest in questionibus de Facto,*

And Cardinal Baronius saye: the same, upon the same subject of the sixth Oecumenical Council. *The Condemnation, even of General Councils, is not received with so much rigour, in what concerns mens persons, and their writings: For no man doubts, but that whosoever he be, he may be deceived in matters of Fact: in which occasion, the saying of St. Paul is applicable, we can do nothing against truth, but for truth. In his enim quæ facti sunt, unumquemque contingere posse falli, nemini dubium est.*

All other Divines, even the more wedded to the interest of the Court of Rome, have hitherto contain'd themselves within these bounds. But the Jesuits will neither admit Bounds nor Examples in their excesses and extravagancies. It is not enough for them to make the Pope infallible, in the manner as some other Divines have done; they must needs have it, that Jesus Christ hath given him the same infallibility, which Himself enjoyed here on earth: and as this infallibility of Jesus Christ reached to all things, and not only to matters revealed, but also to such, as till then had not been reveal'd, and which he revealed by uttering them; so they will have the Pope to become infallible, not only in proposing to the Church the truths comprised in Divine Revelation, but also certain facts, which we are sure were never revealed by God: as, whether such Propositions be found in a Book compos'd in the 17<sup>th</sup>. AGE.

These are not consequences drawn by others out of their Doctrine; They themselves infer them, and make them passe for Catholick Assertions, according to the Title of their Conclusions. *There is then in the Church an infallible Judge of controversies of Faith, even out of a General Council, as well for questions of right, as of fact.* And that we may not doubt of their meaning by questions of Fact, though the word it self of Fact, taken in opposition to that of Law or Right, doth sufficiently clear it; they alleage for an example, and a consequence of this new infallibility of Jesus Christ communicated to the Pope; that

at after the foresaid Constitutions, one may beleive with Divine Faith that Jansenius his book is heretical, and that the five Propositions are truly this Authors. *Unde post Innocentij X, & Alexandri VII, Constitutiones fide divina credi potest, librum cui titulus est Jansenij Augustinus, esse hereticum, & quinque propositiones ex eo decerptas esse Jansenii.*

Behold the Proposition which they publickly advance in the face of the greatest City of the World: nor will it be amisse to take notice of the origin and date thereof: For these same men that now so boldly maintain it, had for some time agoe laid the seeds of it in their other writings: and it was easily discernable that their whole conduct was to be built upon this error. They had severally exposed the Inferences in one place, and the Principles in an other; but still with certain windings, and intricacy of words, that might as occasion served, be a cloak to them. It is now in fine that they discover to the Church without any maske what they pretend to establish.

Let the whole Church then hear and take notice, that the 12 of December in the year 1661. was the day, on which the Jesuits brought to light this monstrous opinion, whereof they had been so long in labour: that this was the day, on which they proposed, as a Catholick assertion, that the Pope speaking out of his Chair, bath the same infallibilitie with Jesus Christ, not only in questions of Right, but also in those of Facts; and consequently that one may believe with Divine Faith, that the five propositions are the opinions of Jansenius.

It is not conceived needful, My Lords, to use many words, to make appear, that there is not here a simple Error, nor a simple Heresie, but a Source of Errors, and as one may say, a General Heresie, which overthrows all Religion.

For your Lordships know, that the first and principal ground of Christian Religion, is this, that our Faith doth not depend on the word of Men, but on the word of God, who is truth itself; that this is it which makes it inconcusible and wholly Divine; whereas it would be purely humane, did it rely upon any Authority lesse than That of God: or that we could not bear the like Testimony to our selves, which

which St. Paul did to the Christians of *Thessalonaica*, to have received the word which God was pleased to propose to us by his Church, not as the word of Man, but as the word of God, as it truly is. *Non ut verbum hominum, sed sicut est vere, verbum Dei.* All whatsoever is comprehended under the notion of Faith (saith St. Bernard) is founded upon the solid truth, persuaded us by the Oracles of God, confirmed by miracles, and consecrated by the Child-bearing of a Virgin, by the blood of our Redeemer, and the glory of Jesus raised from the dead. *Totum quod in Fide est certa ac solida veritate subnixum, oraculis & miraculis divinitus persuasum, stabilitum, & consecratum partu Virginis, sanguine Redemptoris, gloria Resurgentis.*

Whoever then saith, A thing not revealed nor attested by God, (as, that certain Propositions are truly such an Authors of these later ages) is an object of Divine Faith, because the Pope hath declared it; either establishes for the ground of Faith, an authority purely human, and the word of a man, which is as much as to overthrow Faith; or makes a God of the Pope, and of his word, a divine word, and Holy Scripture; which is not only an Heresie, but a horrible impiety, and a kinde of Idolatry.

For Idolatry doth not consist onely in giving to man the name of God, but much more in ascribing to him the attributes proper to God, and the honour which is due only to him. Now this submission of our understandings and intellectual faculties, implied in each Act of Faith; is nothing else than the adoration which we exhibite to the primary Truth: and so whoever pays it to the word of Man, what rank soever he holds in the Church; whoever professes he believes a thing with Divine Faith, on no other motive then because a Man hath said it; places a Man in the Throne of God, transferres the honour due only to the Creator, to a Creature, and, for as much as lies in him, makes a kinde of Idol of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

And that, my Lords which will give you a greater horror of this Impiety, is this, that the Authors thereof imagin'd they should be able to foster it, under favour of the respect, which all the Catholicks bear the Pope; and that no man would

have

have the boldness to oppose it, for fear of incurring his displeasure; whereas on the contrary, could any one commit a greater outrage against the first Minister of Jesus Christ, then to imagine he could be honoured by a Blasphemy so injurious to *Jesus Christ*; that it could be pleasing to him to be made equal to his Master, by sharing with him the same Infallibility which he possesseth, and that men should yield to his words that Supream Worship of Divine Faith, which is due to God alone.

S. *Paul* and S. *Barnabe*, perceiving the people went about to give them the same honours which they were wont to pay to their false Gods, tore in pieces their garments, thereby to express the extream displeasure which they resented; and cast themselves into the midst of the Assembly to hinder it: And we may with reason believe, that the Pope himself, were he truly advertised of this horrible excess, would not fail to employ his whole Authority to suppress these profane worshippers, and would abhor it as a crime able to cause the loss of himself in the sight of God, to give way to the least compliance in so detestable a flattery. He would with trembling reflect on the just vengeance of God, upon that last King of the *Jews*, for only suffering the tumultuary acclamations of a giddie brain'd people, who, hearing him speak, cryed out, It was the voice of a God, and not of a man; *Dei vocis & non hominis*: For the Scripture teacheth us that immediatly the Angel of our Lord stroke him, because he had not given to God the honor due unto him: *Confertim autem percussit eum, Angelus Domini, eo quod non dedisset honorem Deo*. And yet how much lesse criminal was the flattery of that people, then this of the *Jesuites*; theirs might have passed for a sudden transport of joy, not regulated by reason; and sometimes the Holy Scripture it self gives the Name of God to Supream Judges and Princes: But here is given to the Pope deliberately upon a laid Design, and by way of establishing a Dogmatical Assertion of Theologie, not an empty and insignificant name, but one of the most glorious Attributes of God, and most incommunicable to a creature, to wit, that his Word should have entailed upon it such an *infallibility*, as to deserve that submission

sion of divine Faith, which cannot without Idolatry be rendered to any but the first and sovereign Verity.

For the like cannot be said in this question, which those who maintain the Popes infallibility in matters of Faith, are wont to answer, That in beleiving the decisions of the Pope, they do not build their Faith on the word of a man; because he doth but propose what hath been formerly revealed by God in Holy Scripture and Tradition, and so their faith relies still on the Word of God. Nothing I say, like this can be applied to the matter in hand, in regard whereof the *Jesuites* pretend, That the Pope is as infallible as Jesus Christ, and that his decision is an Object of Divine Faith. For when the Pope shall propose a fact of the 17<sup>th</sup> Age; as that certain Heretical Propositions were taught by an Author of those times; it cannot be pretended that he proposes a matter revealed in Scripture or Tradition: He may well say, I judge it to be thus; but he cannot say, God hath revealed it. He may speak as from himself, but he cannot say, God hath spoken; *Dominus locutus est*: And, as it is a man that speaks, and not God, all they who hold that one may beleieve with divine Faith, a decision of this nature, do most visibly commit the like abominable excess, which that blinded people did, by crying out with them, *Voces Dei & non hominis*.

And albeit the Popes piety be a sufficient Antidote to preserve him from being poisoned with this sacrilegious opinion, nevertheless, they who present this poison unto him cannot excuse themselves from being as guilty towards him, as were those wretched Sycophants towards their King, of whose death, they were the cause, by their impious flatteries. For a man is not then only esteemed a murderer either of the soul or body, when effectively he takes away the life of one or the other, but also when he lays a cause, which of its own nature is sufficient to work the death of either, though the effect do not follow. So *S. Cyprian* calls those Christians Parricides, who through fear of persecution, offered up to the Idols their sucking Infants: because although they could not really deprive them of the life of Grace, which they had received in Baptism, by this Idolatry whereunto they were in no sort consenting, as *S. Au-*  
*stin*



sin remarks; they did notwithstanding what lay in them, to bereave them of it. *In illis quidem intersectionem non faciunt, sed quantum in ipsis est, interfectores sunt.* Flatter not your selves, saith S. Austin, speaking to those who give occasion to others of committing sin, upon account that your brother is not dead by the scandal you gave him; it is true, he is not dead, and yet you are murderers: *Et ille vivit, & tu homicida es.* One may say the same to the Jesuites, in respect of the Pope, whom they go about to poison with so pestiferous an opinion: *Non sibi blandiantur, quia ille non est mortuus, & ille vivit, & isti homicida sunt.*

But it is not the Pope only, before whose feet they cast this stumbling block, but even the generality of the faithful, by persuading them to build their belief on the word of a man, and to submit their judgements thereunto, as to the first Verity, which as hath been shewed, cannot be done without a kinde of Idolatry: Insomuch that the Jesuites are near upon the same impiety with those Hereticks, who would have Divine honours exhibited to the Blessed Virgin; for, as the true respect and veneration due to her, as the most holy of Creatures, took not any thing off from the crime of those Hereticks and their followers; even so the reverence which all the faithful ought to bear to the Head of the Church, will in no sort exempt them from a heavy sin before almighty God, if through the deceit of the Jesuites, they give unto the words of a man how eminent soever he may be in the Church, that sovereign difference of divine Faith, which cannot without impiety be given to any thing but the Word of God himself.

Worldly men make small accompt of these kind of sins, because, being wholly buried in flesh and blood, none but grosse and material Objects make Impression on them. Deluded devotes permit themselves to be easily carried away with these excesses; because they imagin it to be a part of their false Piety, to imbrace blindly whatever contributes to the honour and advantage of those things and persons, for which they ought to have a respect, and from this root are sprung all those opinions, which they call *pious*, without ever examining whether they be true or false: as if a falsity could be the object of piety,



or that God, who is truth, could be honoured with the unclean Sacrifice of a Lie. But you, My Lord, know that all those who have been nourished with the true spirit of Christianity, make a far different judgement hereof: they equally hate a lie, to whose advantage soever it redound, whether of the Pope, or the Blessed Virgin, or of Jesus Christ himself: which yet would a little startle a man to hear, had not St. Austin expressly taught it: For this Holy Father fears not to maintain that, if a lye or calowny, which one makes use of to take away the temporal life of Man, be a detestable crime; That is yet a far greater, which tends to the destruction of his spiritual life; as all manner of lyes in matter of Religion, even though employed in giving false praises to Jesus Christ. For which reason, the same Father says, that a Christian would commit a notorious folly, who would not rather expose himself to all manner of indignities, even those that strike the greatest horror into pious Souls; then condescend to the insolence of a person, that would force him to corrupt the holy Gospel, thereby to bestow false praises upon Jesus Christ.

Since then, according to the Judgement of this great Father, it would be a crime & abomination to give false honours to Jesus Christ himself, who being God, is above all our praise and honours; how much more abominable is it, to give a mortal Man, invironed with infirmities, as the Scripture says, the honours that appertain to God alone? But into what a labyrinth of errors will not men run headlong, if one grant them the freedom to cloak their capricious fancies with the mantle of piety? For if opinions must be born with, how false soever they be, because a false piety judges them pious; and if this be a plausible reason to exempt Popes from the common defects of humane nature, that one may piously believe, that God, having entrusted them with the Government of his Church, will have a care to preserve them from falling into defects prejudicial to the good thereof; as the Jesuits from this ground conceive they have a right to invest the Pope in the same state of infallibility with Jesus Christ, even in matters of Fact, when they propose them to the whole Church: Why may not others lay claim to the same right, of attributing to him the same impeccability which Jesus Christ had, in all such affairs

affairs as concern the Government of the Church, and the Functions of his Sovereign Pontificate? Why shall this latter opinion be lesse pious, than the former? doth it not appear more advantageous to the Church, that the Head thereof should be in this sort impeccable, then that he should be infallible in matters of Fact? And have not an infinity of Souls, redeem'd with the Sacred Blood of *Jesus Christ*, received damages incomparably greater, by the evil Government of some Popes, than they can possibly receive by their want of understanding or due attention in the perusal of a particular Author.

Some one that should have lived in the first ages of the Church, catching hold of these seeming conveniences of mans weak understanding, would he not have thought himself well groundd to assert.

That God would never permit the seat of St. *Peter* to be possess'd, for the space of almost an Age together, by persons most unworthy of that dignity; As *Card. Baronius* acknowledges with grief to have hapened, during the far greater part of the tenth Age, by the power of the *Marques of Tuscany*, who tyrannising, what with arms, what with mony, over the Clergy and people of *Rome*, caused them to enthrone in St. *Peters* Chair, Men not only vicious in their own persons, but also notoriously dammageable to the Church; into which they brought most horrible disorders; as that in particular of *John the Tenth*, whereof *Baronius* sadly complains, who made an Infant of five years old Archbishop of *Rheimes*; on which the Cardinal makes this reflexion: *Tantum nefas, quo Iura omnia Ecclesiastica sauciantur, ejus pontificis autoritate introductum, quem infamis femina infami operâ in Petri solium intrussisset.*

Would he not have believed, that God Almighty would never have suffered, the Vicar of Him, who made that solemn Protestation, that his Kingdom was not of this World; to attempt the disposing of Temporal Kingdoms; to take them from some, and confer them on Others; as *Julius* the second did That of *Navarre*, which, to the prejudice of our Kings; the Kings of *Spain* possesse upon me no other title, than a pretended

tended guilt of the Pope, in taking it from its lawful King ?

Would he not have thought, that God would never have permitted Schisme to have crept even into the Chair of Unity; in such sort, that the Church for almost 40 years should not have been able to discern its true, from its false Pastour; groaning under the oppression of two Mercenaries, struggling for the right Title, and agreeing only in this joyned design, to keep the Church in this dismal division; as in effect it happened about the end of the 14<sup>th</sup>. Age, whilst one of these *Anti-popes* kept his seat at *Avignon*, the other at *Rome* ?

Would he not have thought, that God would never have permitted, that he, whose principal charge it is to keep all Christians in Unity, should by rash and precipitate excommunications, be the Cause, that whole Kingdoms should fall off from the Communion of the Church; whereby an infinite number of Souls should miserably suffer shipwreck against the Rocks of Schisme and Heresie; as it happened to the Kingdom of *England*, by the precipitancy of *Clement* the Seventh; as Cardinal *Peron* most pregnantly represented to *Paul* the fifth, to keep him from falling into a like oversight in the cause of the *Venetians*; adding the example of *Leo* the Tenth in regard of *Germany*, and remonstrating to him, That he ought to consider, he was then in the same Crisis, and at the same point, in which *Leo* the tenth was the ruine of Catholick Religion in *Germany*; in which *Clement* the seventh destroyed It in *England*, in which *Clement* the eighth preserved It in *France*.

It is certain, that, to confine our discourse to what may appear advantageous to the Church, and to what we (according to our weak understanding) would be apt to judge fitting to be done; had any of those that appear the wisest among Men, been admitted in to the Council of God, when he was casting the models of his Church; they would all have concurred in this judgement, that it would be in no sort expedient, to permit those who were to supply his place upon earth, to fall in to disorders so opposite to the duty of their Charge, and so prejudicial to the Souls of Men, committed to their conduct. But the Counsels of God are intirely different from those of Men; and he was pleased out of his inscrutable judgements,

by the succeeding events, quite to confound our pretended wisdom. For he permitted all that, which we would have conceiv'd he ought to have prevented: So that Persons truly pious ought to be convinced, by so many deplorable examples, of this important verity, that God would not have the firm subsistence of his Church depend on the Saintity, wisdom, or clear-sightedness of any one single person, though he were the Head and Sovereign Pastor of it. This is the pious reflection which *Cardinal Baronius* makes upon the disorders of the 10th. Age: To the end, says he, that God might make appear that his Church was not the contrivance of Man, but an Institute purely divine, it was necessary he should shew, that the vices of bad Popes, should never be able to destroy It: as Kingdoms often are overthrown by the vicious lives of their Kings. *Ut enim Deus significaret eandem suam Ecclesiam nequaquam humanum esse figmentum, sed plane divinum inventum, oportuit ostendisse eam nequaquam pravorum Antistitum opera perdi posse, & ad nihilum redigi; sicut de aliis diversarum gentium regnis & bene statutis Rebus-publicis factum constat.*

It is the same case of this kind of *Infallibility*, which by a new and unheard-of error the *Jesuits* grant to the Pope: which God hath permitted to be disproved by so many evident examples, that not any Divine can give credit to it, without condemning himself of formal Heresie; for if all the decisions of Popes, touching matters of Faith, were as many Articles of Faith, there not being one able Divine, that doth not impugne some one of them, there would not be one that did not impugne a point of Faith.

For example, who is there now a dayes that doth not esteem the Letters imputed to the first Popes, not only not to be Theirs, but contrariwise, a Rapsody collected by some Forger and Impostor. And notwithstanding both *Pope Nicholas* commanded the Bishops of *France* to receive them, and his Successors inserted them into the book of *Decretals*, which by their Apostolical authority they proposed to serve for a rule to the whole Church, wherein they speak, at least, as much out of their Chair, as in their ordinary *Bulls*. How then can one, without Impiety, believe, that these Letters are supposititious,

positions, as now all the ablest Church-men do, even the Jesuits themselves, if there be an obligation to hold the same Infallibilitie in the Popes, as in *Jesus Christ*, even in matters of Fact? would the infallibility of Christ permit that one should propose to the Church false pieces instead of true ones?

There are scarce any matters of Fact of more importance to the Church, then to know whether a Council be General or no, whether Lawful or illegitimate. Nevertheless, did the Kingdom of *France* become Heretick, for not acknowledging the Council of *Florence* to be Oecumenical, notwithstanding all the Bulls of *Eugenius* the fourth, and all his declarations prefixed at the head of this Council, to oblige the whole world to receive it as a General one? Did the Cardinal of *Lorraine* fall into Heresie, when he openly declared to *Pope Pius* the fourth, his, and the whole Kingdome of *France's* opinion on this subject, in the following terms: For as much as concerns the last of the Titles to be given to our Holy Father, taken out of the Council of *Florence*; I cannot deny but that I am a French man, bred up in the University of *Paris*, in which it is the common Tenet, that the authority of a Council is above the Pope, and all that hold the contrary are censured as Hereticks: That in *France* the Council of *Constance* is held Oecumenical in all its parts: That they adhere to That of *Basle*, and hold That of *Florence* neither for a Lawful nor a General One: and it were an easier work to kill all French men, then to draw them from their said perswasion. This Letter which the Cardinal of *Lorraine* writ to his Secretary at *Rome*, to be communicated to *Pope Pius* the 4<sup>th</sup>. is to be seen in the collection of Memorials concerning the Council of *Trent*, published by the deceased Mr. *Du Puis*, and printed by *Cramoisi*.

During the first disagreement betwixt *Pope Eugenius* the 4<sup>th</sup>. and the Council of *Basle*, he put forth a most authentick Bull, by which he declared that he transferr'd this Council to *Bologna*, and that all those who should maintain this Translation was just and lawful, were both out of the Truth and Catholick Faith. *Fuit igitur a Basiliensi civitate legitima pro tunc nostra Concilii dissolutio, & asserentes contra sunt penitus ab omni veritate & fide Catholica alieni.* All which notwithstanding the Fathers of the Council of *Basle*, maintaining that this Translation

tion was unjust and invalid, *Eugenius* was forced by another Bull equally authentick, to acknowledg that the said Translation was in effect null, and that the Council had been duely held from its beginning to that very time. Both these Bulls are to be seen in *Raynald*; the first in the year 1433. the other in the year 1434. Now, shall the one and the other of these Bulls be Articles of Faith? and shall we be obliged to believe that the same Council was at the same time, an unlawful conventicle, and a Lawful Synod of the whole Church, assembled in the name of the Holy Ghost.

The same *Raynald* makes mention of an other Bull of *Eugenius* the 4<sup>th</sup>. against the Cardinal of *Arles* who presided over the Council of *Basle*; where he is called *Iniquitatis Alumnus, atque perditionis filius*. If the voice of Popes, in the judgements which they make of persons in their Bulls, ought to be esteemed as infallible as that of *Jesus Christ*, we should be obliged to look upon this Cardinal as a most wicked person: but what if God hath judged otherwise, and if, from obliging us to abhor him as a *Child of Iniquity, and a Son of Perdition*, he would have us bear respect and veneration to him, as one of the Blessed, confirming his Saintity by publick Miracles, authorized by an other Pope, to wit, *Clement* the Seventh, who by an authentick Bull has enrolled him in the number of the Blessed, declaring, not that he did penance after having been a Son of Iniquity, but that *he had ever a celestial, chaste, and immaculate life*; as it is to be seen in the Bull of his Beatification, reported at length by *Ciaconius*.

These few examples may sufficiently shew the falsity of the Jesuits pretension. But without seeking further, the very Authors themselves, of this new Doctrine, fall into Heresie, by the undeniable sequels of their error. For in these very same Conclusions, they maintain, that Pope *Honorius*, in his Letters taught nothing but what was most consonant to the Catholick Faith, touching the two wills, and two operations in *Jesus Christ*. *Duas in Christo voluntates & operationes fuisse profitemur; nec aliud a nobis sensit Honorius dum operationem Christi unicam esse scripsit*. Now, if it be a point of Faith, as the Jesuits pretend, that the Book of *Jansenius* is Heretical, and



the five Propositions are his, because two Popes have affirmed it, and that one ought to consider what they say with the same regard as if Jesus Christ had said it; with how much more reason may one say the same of the letters of Pope *Honorius*, which were both strictly examined, condemned and burnt by the Authority of a General Council of the whole Church, in which the Pope presided by his Legats, and which in this very point was confirmed by two following General Councils, and by a great number of Popes? For if ever Popes speak out of their chair, it is then chiefly when they speak in General Councils, and in the confirmation of them by their Apostolical power.

And so consequently one cannot doubt, but that *Leo* the second spoke out of his Chair, when in divers Letters which he wrote in confirmation of the sixth Oecumenical Council, he in particular ratified the Condemnation of *Honorius*, pronouncing an *Anathema* against him, *because in stead of enlightning the Church* [these are his words] *by the Doctrine of Apostolical Tradition, he suffered it to be defiled by a profane corruption. Qui hanc Apostolicam Ecclesiam non Apostolicâ Traditionis doctrinâ instravit, sed profanâ traditione immaculâri permisit.* And consequently, if, when the Popes speak out of their chair, of what matter soever they speak, whether of right, or of Fact, they enjoy the same Infallibility with Jesus Christ, and that all they so pronounce is an Article of Faith; it ought to be a point of Faith that the Letters of *Honorius* are Heretical, and he that denies it, especially after having asserted this General Maxime, bears in his forehead the most notorious mark of an Heretick, according to *S. Paul*, which is, to be condemned by his own proper judgement.

Nor will it serve, to have recourse to the pretended falsifying of the Acts of the sixth Council, and of the letters of *Leo* the second; For as this pretension is both unsustainable, ridiculous and extravagant, (as in the last Assembly of the Clergy, the Bishops even most addicted to the *Jesuits* did acknowledge) if there were no other then this poor evasion to excuse men from beleiving with Divine Faith, that *Honorius* was just-ly



ly anathematiz'd, and his Letters legally condemned, as full of Heresies; one must needs have renounced all common sense, to make any other judgement of this Pope, or not to hold his Letters for heretical.

But, as it is the property of Error to destroy it self, the same person, that by this new Opinion of the *Jesuites* should be engaged of necessity to maintain these Letters of *Honorius* to be Heretical; by the same principle would be obliged to acknowledge the falsity of his own opinion. For how could he believe that all the Popes were indued with this infallibility of *Jesus Christ* speaking out of *their chair*; seeing *Honorius* fell into an error, in a conjecture where it is hard to conceive how he should not speak out of *his chair*, since he spoke as Judge of controversies of Faith, for the adjusting the greatest variance that then reigned in the Church, and which had divided all the Patriarchs of the East. And nevertheless, without insisting on the judgement of the Sixth Council, and supposing, which yet is most absurd, that the Acts of it were corrupted; how can any one pretend that *Honorius* in this occasion, was assisted with the Infallibility of *Jesus Christ*, since having by his Letters approved the letter of *Sergius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, either he understood it rightly, and then he fell into an Error of right, by approving an heretical Opinion of one only Will in *Jesus Christ*, which he must have acknowledged to have been contained in the letter of *Sergius*: Or else he mis-understood the said letter, taking in a Catholike sense, that which *Sergius* writ in an heretical one, in which case he must needs have erred at least in a matter of Fact.

So that the *Jesuites* can in no sort avoid being Heretikes, for if it be an heresie, as questionless it is, to ascribe to the Popes, speaking out of *their chair*, the same infallibility which *Jesus Christ* hath, as well in matters of right, as of fact, in such sort that their decision even in matters of Fact, may be believed by divine Faith, then they must needs be Hereticks, because they are engaged to maintain not an heresie only, but a blasphemy: And if they pretend this opinion is true, they are likewise Heretikes, because they impugn faith, by impugning the decision of so many Popes and General Councils touching the condem-

nation of *Honorius*, whom, according to their erroneous Opinion, one is bound to beleieve by divine Faith, to have been most justly condemned, since it was by the sentence of Judges, as infallible, both in matters of right, and of fact, as Jesus Christ himself.

*My Lords*, I dwell too long upon the refutation of so visible a folly, but permit me to lay before you one other pernicious consequence thereof. Your Lordships have seen the design of their Conclusions, and how glorious a Title they prefix before them: *Affertiones Catholicae contra saeculorum omnium praecipuas Haereses*. What can a man rationally conceive, when he sees what Doctrines (in pursuance of that Title) they oppose to these heresies, but that their meaning is to obtrude them upon us for Catholick truths, maintained by the Church against Hereticks, and which we are bound to embrace under pain of Heresie, and of falling off from the Communion of the Church. Wherefore according to the *Jesuites*, the Catholike Church can never receive the *Grecians* back into Communion, nor reunite its members cut off by so deplorable a Schism, otherwise then by obliging them to confess that *Jesus Christ* hath given to the Popes the same infallibility which he himself had, in all they propose to the whole Church, even particular Facts. And as all Heretikes of these latter Ages have embraced the Error of the *Grecians*, touching the Primacy of the Holy Seat; so likewise neither can we open the Church doors to any of them, upon other terms then by extorting from them a profession of this new Article of Faith.

But admitting the Church should not tie them to such hard measure, yet what a World of Obstacles are by this opinion cast in the way of their conversion? What scandall doth it not give them? What a fair pretext doth it afford their Ministers, to decry the Catholick Church in their Sermons to their abused flock, and render it odious and contemptible, and confirm them in their ancient reproach and calumny, so often cast upon Catholicks of equalling the Pope with God almighty?

It is well known that this was the principal Engine to work so many people to a revolt from the Church. Is it possible, that even Religious persons should concur with them in so pernicious

nitious a design, and furnish them with armes to fight against us, giving them a just occasion to look upon the submission which all faithful Christians yield to the Pope, as an insupportable yoke imposed on their consciences, even in matters that no ways concern the Catholick Faith, nor whereof the knowledge doth in any sort contribute to Salvation.

This is it, *My Lords*, that hath chiefly forced us to speak in this ranconter: It was absolutely necessary that Catholick Divines should make all hast to cry out against this impiety, lest these uncircumcised should take occasion to insult over the Hosts of the living God: We were obliged to prevent them, that it might appar to all the World, that these excesses were no lesse detested in the Catholick Church, out of the love of truth, then they seemed to detest them upon the accompt of justifying their guilty separation.

But if, to have exposed their complaints to the publick, be enough to acquit Divines of the duty incumbent on them; it will not suffice for the honour of the Church, and an entire reparation of this scandal, that they alone should speak in this occasion. 'Tis your part, *My Lords*, who ought to be inflamed with a pious zeal for the purity of Christian Doctrine, whereof you are the Depositories; for the safety of Souls, whereof you are the Spiritual Fathers; for the Sanctity of the Church, whereof you are the Bridegrooms; for the honour of *Jesus Christ*, whose chief Ministers you are; to consider before Almighty God, what service you owe him, in an occasion of this importance, where the Faith of the Church is violat'd by a capital error that strikes at the very roots thereof, where the Faithful are in danger to be poysoned by an opinion, that tends to change into Idolatry the veneration which they owe to their Sovereign Pastor; where the Church is profaned by an impiety, that dishonours and exposes it to the outrages of its enemies; and finally where *Jesus Christ* is horribly blasphemed by a Sacrilegious parity, which they endeavour to establish betwixt his sacred words, and those of his Minister, by making the one, as well as the other, the object of Divine Faith.

Some one perchance may say, it is an extravagance, which deserves not to have such notice taken of it; and this without question

question will be the pretext to move you to connive at such an excess. But you ought to consider, *My Lords*, that how extravagant soever the opinion may be, It is advanc'd by persons who may give a just occasion to apprehend strange consequences of it. For clearly, it is not by chance, or the blind passion of some one private person, that it now comes to light; but of old there have been dispositions laid for the introducing it: nor was it ushered in with such pompe and ceremony, but just at that nick of time which they conceived most favourable to procure it a successful acceptance, and in which they thought, not any one would have the boldness to hold up his hand in opposition to it.

Their pretensions perchance are not yet ripe enough to draw a formal approbation of it from the Bishops; but their hopes are, since we must speak the plain truth, that their credit, and the power, which of late they have got, of doing both good and bad Offices, will at least be able to keep them in silence; so that not one shall dare attempt the condemnation of it, for fear of drawing on his head the vengeance of so potent a Society; and that the *Sorbone*, which now they think they have brought to their beck, will never have the confidence to censure it, what aversion soever it may have inwardly for it.

They hope then, under the favour of this silence, and whilst the whole world shall seem buried in sleep, *dum dormirent homines*, this cockle, which they have sowed in the fields of the Church, will take root and grow up by the advantage of the season; In the mean time they will leave it to grow to maturity, according to their manner of expression, *relinquent tempori maturandum*: and when it shall be fully ripe, they will extract the natural consequences; that necessarily must spring from it. For the present, they tell us modestly, one may believe with Divine Faith such like particular Facts; but we shall shortly hear, that we are bound to believe them; which graduation will be easie for them to establish, because it follows by necessary consequence out of their principle; it being certain that no man can believe with Divine Faith, but what is a matter of Faith: and what is such, ought of necessity to be believed in that nature, when it shall be sufficiently proposed. It is

enough

enough for their turns at present, that the Bishops do not condemn this opinion: but we shall see them ere long inveigle them in, to be the approvers of it, according to an other of their Maximes, which is; That the Church doth approve all such Doctrines, as It suffers without making opposition.

It highly concerns you, *My Lords*, to reflect on the danger whereunto not only the Church, but you your selves are also exposed; lest one day the *Jesuits* bring you in for abettors of their Heresie, and God himself lay it to your charge. For though it be a most false error, that the Church approves all opinions which it doth not suppress, it is notwithstanding a constant truth, confirmed by Popes and Councils, that God imputeth to Pastors the approval of errors, which they did not in due time oppose. *Error cui non resistitur, approbatur Qui non corrigit refecanda, committit.* Which made the second Council of *Tours* declare, that the Shepherd seem'd to side with the Woolf, as often as he did not hinder the slaughter of his flock, having the power to do it. And *St. Leo*, speaking of those that were negligent in applying remedies to the grievances of the Church, lays them all at their doors: *Qui multam sepe nutriunt pestilentiam, dum necessariam dissimulant adhibere medicinam.* But these are reflexions altogether needlesse to be suggested to you, *My Lords*, whose zeal and Pastoral vigilance is of greater force to represent you what is expedient for the good of the Church in these occasions, then all the discourses that can be made you. It is enough for private Divines to lay before your eyes the emergent evils, and deep wounds inflicted on its Doctrine, and only to say to each of you in particular the same which a Prophet said to God, *Vide, Domine, & considera.* See and consider what Doctrine is taught in the Church, whereof you are the Masters. Their duty extends no further, and this done, they may take up their rest, and lament before Almighty God in Silence and Humility.

Paris the 1st. of  
January 1662.

FINIS.